

HX
632
A1
W9
no. 795

HSS



14 4 4 4
790

THE COMMUNIST PARTY AND THE WAR



A RECORD OF
HYPOCRISY AND TREACHERY
TO THE WORKERS OF EUROPE



HX
632
A1
W9
No. 795

PUBLISHED BY
THE LABOUR PARTY

2D

NOTE

The Communist Party have again applied for affiliation to the Labour Party. Previous applications have always been decisively rejected by the Party Conference. Last year even a proposal for "co-operation" with the Communist Party was rejected by 1,899,000 votes to 132,000.

In the past the case against Communist affiliation has always been overwhelming and convincing. That case has been reinforced by the War Record of the Communist Party—a record of hypocrisy and treachery to the workers. The Record is set out in the following pages. It should be read and studied by every member of the Labour Party who should keep in mind the fact that this Record constitutes but one part of the overwhelming case against Communist affiliation to-day.

March 1943

LIBRARY
UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

THE COMMUNIST PARTY AND THE WAR

A Record of Hypocrisy and Treachery to the Workers of Europe

The Communists are again trying to get into the Labour Party. They have made another application for affiliation.

They are conducting a well-organised and energetic campaign in all parts of the country to win the support of the National Trade Unions, Trade Union branches and Divisional and Local Labour Parties, as well as individual members of the Labour Party. Press articles and press correspondence, platform speeches, and a vast amount of literature are pouring out.

The Communists are cynics and opportunists. They know they have an awkward and embarrassing record. They know it will prove extremely inconvenient and injurious to them if it is brought up.

They believe that if their misdeeds, which are many and flagrant, can be kept hushed up, they will be able to ride into the Labour Party on the flood of world-wide admiration for the heroic achievements of the peoples and armies of the U.S.S.R. They think that a situation now exists in which it can be made to appear that refusal to affiliate them will be an insult and an offence to our Soviet Allies.

It is a promising tactic—cynical, opportunist and dishonest, it is true—but the Communists think it might do the trick.

So they say, let's forget the past. Don't bring up old out-worn arguments or inconvenient hard facts. Let the dead past bury its dead. We want to affiliate to the Labour Party to strengthen unity for victory over Fascism and for social advance now and after the war.

Communist affiliation does not mean **unity**. It means **disunity**. That categorical conclusion is based, not on present protestations but on past performances of the Communist Party. To prove the truth of it, it is not necessary to go back throughout the years to the first application made by the Communist Party in 1920. Conclusive and compelling proof is to be found during the period of the Fascist World War.

Nowhere has the Communist Party's capacity for the rapid coat-turning that has been so long a familiar characteristic of its activities been more evident than in its attitude towards the war.

The following facts speak for themselves.

APPEASEMENT

The organs of expression of the Communist Party have been leaflets, pamphlets, and the *Daily Worker*. They used all of them, indeed, they flooded the country with leaflets, before Munich and after it, denouncing the policy of appeasement, demanding a Government with, amongst others, Mr. Churchill and Mr. Eden in leading positions, and passionately asking for opposition to the Nazi and Fascist "thugs and murderers."

A JUST WAR

Here are samples of the Communist Party's official statements at the outbreak of war :—

Why Britain Must Defeat Fascism

"The Communist Party has never hidden and never will hide its opinions regarding the fundamental cause of the war, namely, the capitalist system.

"It has never hidden and never will hide its detestation of Fascism and its **readiness to take part in any struggle, political or military, to secure the defeat of Fascism.** For it recognises that the victory of Fascism represents not only a conquest of markets, Colonies, sources of raw materials, etc., it also leads to the forcible destruction of every democratic right and liberty that the working-class has fought so bitterly, and at such cost and sacrifice, to win from its class enemies.

"It is this consideration that is uppermost in our minds now.

"For if these democratic gains were lost, this would represent a defeat for the working-class, which, long after time had healed the wounds caused by the grief and suffering war brings, would involve the most bitter struggles and sacrifices in the future to regain those rights and liberties which are essential for the advancement of the working-class and the achievement of a Socialist world, from which the menace of war will have been removed for ever."

—Statement of the Central Committee of the Communist Party,
Daily Worker. September 2, 1939.

"I will stick at no sacrifice "

"Just as I was ready to make any sacrifice to save the peace of Europe and to save the people of this country from the horrors of war, so **I will stick at no sacrifice to ensure the defeat of Nazi aggression, and to restore lasting peace to the world.**"

—*Mr. W. Gallacher, M.P., House of Commons, September 2, 1939.*

"I said yesterday that I stand for the speedy and effective defeat of the Nazi regime as a sure way of bringing about hope for a lasting peace for the peoples of the world. In taking that stand I want to

declare here, with the utmost confidence, from experience and from knowledge, that I will not come into conflict with the policy of my working class comrades of the Soviet Union."

—*Mr. W. Gallacher, M.P.*, House of Commons, September 3, 1939.

"To Betray Poland is to Betray Britain"

On September 11, 1939, the *Daily Worker*, in an editorial under the above heading wrote :—

"The expected Nazi peace offer has arrived via the speech of General Goering. . . If there was the slightest inclination to treat the Goering plan seriously France and Britain would be in deadly peril. . . For these reasons we must not only avoid the Nazi 'peace trap,' we must have a Government of which the social composition is in itself a guarantee of the will to victory."

"How to Win the War"

On September 14, 1939, the Communist Party issued a pamphlet entitled "How to Win the War," by Harry Pollitt, the Secretary of the Party. This pamphlet was later withdrawn. Here are some quotations from that pamphlet :—

"The Communist Party supports the War, believing it to be a just War which should be supported by the whole working class and all friends of democracy in Britain."

"To stand aside from this conflict, to contribute only revolutionary-sounding phrases, while the Fascist beasts ride roughshod over Europe, would be a betrayal of everything our forbears have fought to achieve in the course of long years of struggle against capitalism."

"The Polish people have had no choice. War has been thrust on them. They have had to fight to defend themselves from a foreign attack whose only purpose is to enslave them to Nazi Germany. The experiences of Austria and Czechoslovakia show what the German conquest of their country would mean."

". . . whatever the motive of the present rulers of Britain and France, the action taken by them—under considerable pressure from their own peoples—is not only helping the Polish people's fight, but is actually, for the first time, challenging the Nazi aggression which has brought Europe into crisis after crisis for the last three years."

"The Government of Britain must at once issue a solemn declaration that the aim of the anti-Hitler alliance is not only to restore the independence of Poland, but also to restore the independence of a democratic Austria and Czechoslovakia."

Communists and the War—Reasons for Support ?

A clue to the reason for the Communist Party's support of the war despite the signing of the Soviet-German Pact on August 21, 1939, was that their line at first was adherence to Stalin's statement to the Eighteenth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union in March, 1939 :

Point 3 : "We stand for the rendering of support to nations which have fallen prey to aggression, and are fighting for the independence of their countries."

This is borne out by the following statements :

(1) From the Statement of the Communist Party of Great Britain on the "Soviet-German negotiations" issued on August 22. After quoting Stalin's statement on foreign policy in full, they say :

"The Soviet Union helped the people of Spain, China, and Mongolia. They will help any country that fights against Fascist aggression and for their independence as a nation."

(2) From the *Daily Worker* comment on August 23 on reports in the foreign press on the pact :

"'Axis' papers—in Germany, Italy, Hungary, and Bulgaria—attach exaggerated importance to the news of the negotiations. The fact that a non-aggression pact would still allow the U.S.S.R. to aid Poland or Rumania if they were victims of an unprovoked Nazi aggression, is conveniently forgotten."

(3) From Harry Pollitt's statement published in the *Daily Worker* on August 26 :

"If there were any aggression by one of the contracting parties, the Soviet Union's record of assistance given to Spain, China and Mongolia would be continued. Point 3 of Stalin's speech (Point 3 is quoted above) and the deeds of the Soviet Union are the proof of this."

NO "PEACE" ARRANGEMENT

The Russian troops entered Poland on September 17, but the *Daily Worker* wrote on September 20, 1939 :

"Is it possible that there are men in the governing circles of France and Great Britain who are contemplating a 'Peace' arrangement with Hitler which leaves all Europe on the other side of the Maginot Line as the helpless prey of German Nazism?"

PARTITION OF POLAND

On September 28, 1939, however, the occupation and partition of Poland on a dual basis was formally agreed upon in a German-Soviet Treaty of Friendship fixing "the frontier of their interests in the former territory of Poland." (Article I of the Treaty).

THE COMMUNISTS TURN THEIR COATS

On September 30, 1939, the Editorial Board published a statement in the *Daily Worker* beginning :

“Arising from the decision taken in Moscow and the peace declaration which has followed, an entirely new situation confronts the people of this country and of Europe.”

An “Imperialistic” War

On October 7, 1939, the Communist Party published a Manifesto in the *Daily Worker* in which it declared :

“The responsibility for the present imperialist war lies equally on all the warring powers.

“This war is a fight between imperialist powers over profits, colonies and world domination.”

“The Soviet Union is leading the world fight for peace.”

The Manifesto also demanded the calling of a Peace Conference immediately.

On October 12 the Communist Party announced through the *Daily Worker* that “The Manifesto of October 7 corrects the declaration on September 2.”

Recantations

On October 11, 1939, Mr. Harry Pollitt was dismissed from the Secretaryship of the Communist Party. On November 23 both he and Mr. J. R. Campbell published in the *Daily Worker* recantations of their support of his fight against Fascism aggression. Mr. Pollitt, amongst other things, said :—

“I recognise that my action in resisting the carrying out of the line of the Communist Party and the Communist International represented an impermissible infraction of our Party’s discipline. . .

“I request the Central Committee . . to give me facilities to prove in deeds that I know how to take my place in the front ranks. . .”

Mr. Campbell was even more abject and ended up by saying :—

“Undoubtedly the stubborn defence of this wrong position did harm to the Party, when it had to make a sharp turn in a most difficult situation, and I must accept responsibility for resisting what has been proved to be the correct line.”

The only “new situation” was the partition of Poland, and the only need for the “sharp turn” was instructions from a higher authority—the Communist International.

Anti-War Propaganda

After the Communist Party line had been brought into line with Soviet Russia the whole attitude changed. If a German parachutist, who could read English, had come down in a remote corner of England and been given a file of the *Daily Worker*, he would have found ample spiritual nourishment in it.

TYPICAL HEADLINES FROM THE "DAILY WORKER"

- "4,000 to Take Holiday in Aid of Aircraft Men."—August 17, 1940.
- "Sound Sirens or We Don't Work."—August 19, 1940.
- "Making Prisons of Our Factories."—January 3, 1941.
- "They Promise Us Greater Hardship in 1941."—January 4, 1941.
- "Strike in Reply to Attack on Convention."—January 6, 1941.
- "Hunger, Disease and Death."—January 7, 1941.
- "Another 'Prison Diet' Week-end."—January 10, 1941.
- "The Grave Threat to Irish Neutrality."—January 10, 1941.
- "4,000 Aircraft Men Win Big Gains in Strike."—January 17, 1941.

SABOTAGE OF THE WAR EFFORT

The technique was simple but effective. The paper was a mass of criticism and of grievances exploited to the full. Wherever possible, an anti-British twist was given. British losses and set-backs, military and political, were emphasised. Doubt was thrown on British claims, and enemy claims were emphasised. Strong backing was given to policies or action which would slow down the war output. Suspicion was deliberately sown. Bremen indeed, was out-Bremened. No single piece of enemy propaganda in this country was so effective as the *Daily Worker*.

The Manchester Guardian, one of the most stalwart defenders of Freedom, made the following comment on January 29, 1941, on the debate on the suppression of the *Daily Worker* on January 21, 1941 :

" . . . The position of the *Daily Worker* is not, as some of those who have written to us appear to think, that of a sincere but roughly spoken critic of the Government . . . "

" . . . The exploitation of the suffering of war (as in the Communists' approach to the people of bombed cities, to which Mr. Morrison so scathingly referred) and the attempted fomentation of trouble in the Forces and the factories have an aspect that the Government rightly regards as intolerable in our present critical state . . . "

" . . . Did they, and some of those who have written criticising our attitude, make the same protest when the Government interned Fascists instead of prosecuting them? The argument for expediency is as strong and as weak in either case. We should all have preferred, of course, a judicial process in both cases. **But we have given the Executive extraordinary powers, and there are some forms of sabotage of the war effort that justify the use of urgent if sharp measures. This was one.**"

Unite to Stop the War

The Central Committee of the Communist Party, in a statement published in the *Daily Worker* on October 4, 1939, said :—

" We demand that negotiations be immediately opened for the establishment of peace in Europe."

A Communist Party Manifesto, October 7, 1939, said :—

“ The truth about this war must be told. **This war is not a war for democracy against Fascism.** It is not a war for the liberties of small nations. It is not a war for the defence of peace against aggression. . . This war is a fight between imperialist powers over profits, colonies and world domination. . . Let a Peace Conference of the Powers be called immediately.”

On October 9, 1939, the *Daily Worker* in an editorial wrote :—

“ Let the people of this country unite to stop the war. That is the first essential. Get the Armistice and the peace talks can begin.”

Why this War ?

In the Communist pamphlet “ Why this War ? ” (November 1, 1939) it was stated :—

“ Chamberlain and Churchill, and the big business interests behind them, have powerful allies in the Greenwoods, Daltons, Bevins and Citrines, the present leaders of the Labour Party and of the Trades Union Congress. These leaders have yoked the Labour Movement to the war machine, to the Government, and to the employing class. **Without the support of organised Labour neither Chamberlain nor any War Government could continue in office a day.**”

The Communist Party called on every section of the working class movement, every divisional Labour Party, every trade union organisation, every socialist, every trade unionist, and co-operator to rally to the common struggle—

To compel the immediate ending of the war.

To end the political truce.

To end the industrial truce.

To end the collaboration of the Labour Party with the Government.

Anti-War By-Election Candidates

The London District Conference of the Communist Party in January, 1940, resolved that the Communist Party must

“ contest every By-election on the basis of candidates, **whether Communist or other**, supported by the united working class movement **on a programme of resolute opposition to the war, defence of the Soviet Union, and support for the economic and social demands of the workers.**”

Pollitt Fights the Labour Party

On February 22, 1940, Harry Pollitt, who in October, 1939, had been dismissed from his post as Secretary of the Communist Party because of the pro-war lead he had given, and who had afterwards “ recanted ” (see page 5), contested the Silvertown By-election in opposition to the Labour Party Candidate. The basis of his policy was : “ The Communist Party fights to end this war.” There was also a Fascist Candi-

date. The *News Chronicle* tersely summed up the position by saying : "The totalitarian twins wanted to stop the war on any old terms, . . ." Both the Communist Candidate and the Fascist Candidate forfeited their deposits. The Labour Candidate polled almost thirteen to one against the "totalitarian twins" combined.

"Changed Situation Demands Change in Tactics."

It is easy to trace the source of instructions which produced the somersault which has been described. It is to be found in "Communism and the War," by G. Dimitroff, Secretary of the Executive Committee of the Communist International, and published on November 18, 1939. In the light of the German-Soviet Agreement, "the changed situation and the new tasks of the working class also demand a corresponding change in tactics of the Communist Parties."

He stated that the tactics in recent years of the United People's Front presupposed "joint action by the *Communist Parties* and the Social Democratic and petty bourgeois "democratic" and "radical" parties against reaction and war. But the leaders of these parties are now openly supporting the *imperialist war*" (our italics).

"The Social Democratic, 'democratic' and 'radical' flunkies of the bourgeoisie, are brazenly distorting the anti-Fascist slogans of the Popular Front, and are using them to deceive the masses of the people and to cover up the imperialist character of the war. Under the Flag of 'national unity' they have, in fact, established a common front with the capitalists, a front stretching from the Conservatives to the Labour leaders in England, and from the Cagoulards to the Socialists in France. The foremost leaders of the Social Democratic Parties and the reformist trade unions shamelessly took up front rank posts in the camp of the imperialists, from the very first day of the war."

NO UNITED FRONT WITH SOCIALIST "LACKEYS"

Then again :

"It now becomes quite clear to all who do not wish to close their eyes to incontrovertible facts that it is the Social Democratic leaders—all these Blums and Paul Faures, Citrines, Attlees, Greenwoods and de Brouckères—who bear the **direct responsibility** for the fact that they, by disrupting the united actions of the international proletariat capable of preventing war, rendered it possible for the bourgeoisie to doom millions of people to destruction for the sake of its mercenary interests. . . ."

"It clearly follows from the above that the Communists can have no united front whatsoever with those in a common front with the imperialists and who support the criminal anti-people's war. The working class and all working people can have no dealings with the Social Democratic, 'demo-

cratic' and 'radical' politicians who are betraying the vital interests of the popular masses. Between the masses of the people and these lackeys of imperialism lies the abyss of war."

LABOUR LEADERS BLAMED FOR NAZI ATTACK ON NORWAY

Communist attacks became more violent and virulent as the weeks passed. They protested on April 10, 1940, that

"peaceful peoples, who have no wish save to remain at peace, are dragged into war against their will ; their homes and countries are made the battleground of the **two imperialist robber camps.**"

"The Chamberlain Government and the Reynaud Government had deliberately provoked this extension of the war in Northern Europe by their violation of Norwegian neutrality. With cynical disregard of international law they deliberately laid minefields in Norwegian territorial waters in order to extend the war."

"We accuse not only Chamberlain and Reynaud, but also the British Labour and Trade Union leaders, of extending the war. They demanded it. They have justified it, and now Norway and Denmark are in the inferno. These Labour and Socialist leaders, in Britain and France, have been in the forefront in demanding the ruthless intensification of the war and have concealed from the people how this meant wholesale violation of international law, the extension of violence, ruin and massacre."

"Corrupt" Labour Leaders

The Communists May Day Call published in the *Daily Worker* on April, 27, 1940, was in similar strain :

"Once again the bankrupt rulers of capitalism can find no solution save a new human holocaust. Once again the millions of workers are dragged from production into uniforms to kill one another. **Once again the false leaders of Labour hound on the slaughter and seek to deceive the people on the character of the war. . .**

"In vain the old threadbare, lying slogans of the war for 'freedom' and the 'rights of small nations' are rattled anew to cover up the reality of the bestial conflict of the giant capitalist empires for world domination.

"In vain the corrupt Labour leaders seek to furbish up anew these slogans with new deceptions about 'the war against Fascism,' as if Chamberlain and Churchill, the worst enemies of the working class, were the champions of democracy and the rights of the people. . .

"End the political truce—the shameful alliance of Labour leaders with the leaders of Capitalism, which is preparing the way for a Coalition War Government to hold the workers in chains."

“ Treacherous ” Top Leaders of the 2nd International

Again the key to the British Communists’ denunciation is to be found in the May Day Manifesto from their superior authority, the Communist International, whose directions they must follow.

The Communist International Manifesto, according to the *Daily Worker* of May 1, 1940, said :

“ In answer to the gross violation by England and France of the neutrality of the Scandinavian countries, Germany led its troops into Denmark and occupied strategic positions in Norway. England and France, in their turn, landed troops. The territory of Norway became a theatre of war. . .

“ The strife between the imperialists in the Pacific threatens to develop into new wars. A dispute has already begun between Japan, England and the U.S.A. over the Dutch East Indies.

“ The bourgeoisie of the U.S.A. are, as a beginning, stretching out their hands to Iceland, Greenland, and the possessions of Britain and France in the Caribbean Sea.

“ The Capitalist miscreants are dragging the peoples into a new world imperialist carnage. . .

“ The British and French warmongers and their **social democratic lick-spittles** are furious at the fact that the Soviet Union occupies a position of neutrality towards their imperialist war. . .

“ Proletarians and working people ! Who helped, and are now helping, the bourgeoisie to deprive you and your children of your last crust of bread, to throttle you with the terror regime of bourgeois dictatorship ? Who, along with the bourgeoisie, prepared the sanguinary heinous crime of which we are witness ?

“ The leaders of Social Democracy and of the Reformist Trade Unions. . .

“ Only in a ruthless struggle against the Social Democratic leaders, against the treacherous top leaders of the Second International can the working people establish such a fighting front. . .”

THE CHURCHILL GOVERNMENT

The *Daily Worker* kept up the attack. On May 10, 1940, on the morning of the German invasion of Holland and Belgium, an editorial stated :

“ Even a blind man can see what is happening. The Labour Party is going to enter the Government. Let’s make a bargain, they say. Throw out Chamberlain and we will save Churchill for you. Then we can go to the Bournemouth Conference, claim a great victory over Chamberlain, and thus get a vote authorising us to enter a reconstructed government.

“ And so, what is the net result ?

“ A new war government emerges, inclusive of the Labour leaders. If the Carlton Club wants the use of these gentle-

men they are, of course, welcome to try their hand, although they will hardly find that Morrison and Bevin are much of an improvement on Chamberlain or Hoare."

Labour's "Eternal Shame"

When the Churchill Government was being formed, the Communist Party in a statement published in the *Daily Worker* on May 11, 1940, stated :

" To their eternal shame the Labour Party leaders have offered to enter a new " National Government " in combination with the most ruthless jingo representatives of capitalism. These same leaders, who had helped to maintain Chamberlain in power through all these years, now accept the leadership of Churchill and come to the rescue of the Diehard imperialists in the intensification of the war. . . .

"Fight against Labour participation in Churchill's new War Government.

" The class which rules, the capitalist class, determines also the aims and purpose of the war. **For them the war is no anti-Fascist war, as the Labour leaders falsely proclaim, but an imperialist war**, a war against the German people to inflict a new super-Versailles, for the maintenance and extension of the British Empire, for the domination of reaction in Europe, and for war on the working class in all countries and against the Socialist Soviet Union. . . ."

Again, on September 14, 1940.

" The ruling class, who have betrayed the people and brought this war upon them, have nothing to offer except ' Blood, toil, tears and sweat.' **The Labour leaders have gone over body and soul to the ruling class.** From them there can be no leadership for the people of Britain. . .

" Only the Communist Party fights the Labour leaders, who have been given positions in the Tory Government in order to attack the workers and to carry through the war policy of the capitalists. . . ."

"The Labour Party has Failed the People."

Hostility to the war, denunciation of the Churchill Government and of Labour Ministers, and criticism of the Labour Party continued to be a main theme of Communist propaganda.

On October 5, 1940, at the height of the air-raids on London, the Communist Party Central Committee published a resolution in the course of which it stated :—

" **The Labour Party, in which millions in the past placed their hope to lead to Socialism, has failed the people.** The Labour Ministers in the Government, the Bevins, Attlees and

Morrison's, are the main support of the rule of reaction, of the Churchills, Chamberlains and Andersons, of the Tory machine and the war profiteers. They are united with the Tories on every issue of policy.

"Under their leadership the local machinery of the Labour Movement has been paralysed, put out of action or distorted to the service of capitalism and the war machine. The air war has exposed their complete abandonment of the interests of the people. **They bear the responsibility for the refusal of the bomb-proof shelters which the Communist Party demanded, and which could have saved the lives of those now dead.**

"They direct their attack against the militant workers. They seek to draw the labour organisations into a type of Labour Front, in which the State, the employers and the official Labour representatives act as a single machine, while the right to strike and all independent working-class activity is prohibited."

"Their path leads to Fascism, to the same type of regime as the Nazi regime in Germany. . ."

THE PEOPLE'S CONVENTION

For months during this period the Communist Party were busy organising through the *Daily Worker* and in other ways the "People's Convention." Mr. John Strachey, at one time very closely connected with the Communist Party but later denounced by them, wrote of the Convention in the *Tribune* on January 10, 1941:

"For it is as certain as that the sun will rise to-morrow that the People's Convention is an Anti-War movement, and that its activities are expressly designed to interfere with our complete victory over Fascism."

The word "democracy" had a great deal of lip service paid to it but there was nothing democratic about the Convention. The names of the Standing Orders Committee were all moved from the platform, and all the speakers were selected by that Committee.

The *Daily Herald* on January 14, 1941, in describing the method of conducting the Convention said :

... "they turned it into a Reichstag. They pretended—as Hitler pretends about the Reichstag—that the delegates were fully representative of popular opinion. But did they allow the delegates to express their opinions? No more than Hitler would have allowed them. . .

"The People's Convention is an incendiary bomb which has failed to explode. . . It will only inspire contempt for the irresponsible fanatics who are trying to exploit Democracy's mortal struggle for the furtherance of their own wild and windy policies."

HITLER ATTACKS RUSSIA

On June 22, 1941, Hitler extended his war of aggression to the East and launched a sudden attack upon the U.S.S.R.

The same day, in a world broadcast, the Prime Minister pledged this country to give every possible help to the U.S.S.R. ; announced that he had **already** offered "any technical or economic assistance" which was in our power to give ; foreshadowed increasing day and night bombing of Germany ; and repeated that "we will never parley, we will never negotiate, with Hitler or any of his gang."

He made it clear that "any man or State who fights against Nazism will have our aid. Any man or State who marches with Hitler is our foe."

How Did the Communist Party React ?

In a statement published in June 23, 1941, as follows :

"Hitler's attack against the Socialist Soviet Union is Fascism's supreme aggression against the people of the world.

"The cause of the Soviet Union is the cause of the working people all over the world, of freedom, of Socialism.

"Hitler's attack will be resisted and defeated by the common action of the working people in all countries in solidarity with the Red Army, Navy, and Air Force of the Soviet workers.

"This attack is the sequel of the secret moves which have been taking place behind the curtain of the Hess mission. . .

"We can have no confidence in the present Government dominated by Tory friends of Fascism and Coalition Labour leaders, who have already shown their stand by their consistent anti-Soviet slander campaigns."

Another Difficult Change in Tactics !

Note, there was no reference to Hitler's attacks upon Poland, Denmark, Norway, Holland, Belgium, Luxemburg, France, Greece, and Yugoslavia. No reference to the fact that Britain had stood alone for over a year, facing the danger of a full-scale invasion, battling successfully with the full might of the German Air Force, and her people heroically enduring the rain of fire and death from Hitler's night bombing raids.

Note, too, the insinuation that Hitler's attack upon Soviet Russia was due, in part, to "secret moves" connected with the flight of the imprisoned Hess to this country.

The Communists were not sure what they should say. They hadn't yet received instructions from their superior authorities. So they just damned the British Government and the Labour Ministers. **But they did execute another complete turn-coat act.**

Anglo-Soviet Treaty.

In May, 1942, this Churchill Government in which "we Communists can have no confidence" concluded the Anglo-Soviet Treaty of Alliance with the U.S.S.R. Premier Stalin himself regards it as marking "an historic turning point in the relations between our country and Great Britain."

Shall Labour "Come Out?"

By July, 1942, the Communists had completely changed their position on two important issues. No longer did they call for the end of "Labour Party collaboration with the Government." On the contrary they insisted that Labour should remain in the Government.

"If the Labour Party approves—as I believe it overwhelmingly does—the Government's main policy of alliance with the Soviet Union and the U.S.A. for the defeat of Hitler, then **it cannot withdraw its members from the Government.**"

This extract is taken from the Communist Party Pamphlet "Labour's Way Forward," written by Emile Burns.

The emphatic view was expressed :

"Nothing could more weaken Labour's position, more submerge its identity among the 'independent' groups which represent everything from sheer muddled thinking to personal careerism and even defeatism, nothing could more silence its authoritative voice in the councils of the nation, than if it abandoned its direct share of responsibility in the government of the country at this supreme crisis."

Maintain the "Shameful Alliance"

But the Communist Party had changed its mind also on the question of the Electoral Truce. No longer did they demand an end to the truce—"the shameful alliance of Labour leaders with the leaders of capitalism." It had become all in favour of the truce and wanted candidates chosen by agreement between Tory, Liberal, Labour, Communist and non-Party organisations in constituencies.

The authority already quoted argued that "for Labour to fight by-elections where the Government candidate is a Tory, is not the way forward."

"The Labour man or woman who votes for a Government candidate who is a Tory is not voting for Toryism, any more than a Tory elector voting for a Government candidate who is Labour is voting for Socialism. **This is not the issue before the electors. The votes are cast for the Government, for national unity in the Allied fight against Hitlerism.**"

The Colonial Peoples

Another example of the Communist Party's hypocritical inconsistency is furnished by their blatant switch of attitude towards the Colonial peoples.

In 1940, when the Communist Party was opposing the war, it said :—

"The Colonial peoples see in this crisis of Imperialism at war the downfall of the British Empire. . . They see it with joy and confidence of liberation by their own unity and mass strength."

But in August, 1941, after Hitler had attacked Soviet Russia, the Communist Party issued this statement :—

"It is felt that if the Nazis won this war then it would mean the most brutal enslavement of all the Colonial peoples. We must see that nothing stands in the way of all parts of the Empire co-operating with Britain and Russia in defeating the common enemy."

The complete contradiction of these two statements is so obvious as hardly to need comment. First, defeat of Britain would mean liberation for the Colonial peoples ; later, defeat of Britain would mean the "most brutal enslavement of all the Colonial peoples."

DISCORD AND DISUNITY MEAN POLITICAL DEATH

Never in the history of British politics has any organised group calling itself a national party been guilty of such a shameful record of disloyalty to the nation, treachery to the working class, and discredit to itself. That record was built up by slavish obedience to an external superior authority (the Communist International) whose instructions were obligatory and whose instructions were obeyed. What guarantee can the Communists give that they may not be called upon again to implement a directive that "the changed situation demands change in tactics ?" Their record shows that guarantees would be worthless.

It is no use saying the Communists are pursuing the right policy to-day. They may again be taking a wrong course to-morrow. **If they had been successful in their anti-war, pro-“peace,” anti-Labour disunity activities between October, 1939, and June, 1941, the working class of Britain and of every other country in Europe would to-day most probably be enslaved in Hitler’s “New Order.”** Fortunately for the workers of all countries, the British Communists failed. But the people of Britain will not forget that, when they "stood alone," the British Communists "stood out."

Every organisation and member of the Labour Party shares in the common responsibility of protecting the Party's unity and well-being. It is their duty to keep the Party free and secure from subversive in-

fluences. I disunity are the seeds of political death. Is there any member of the Party who believes that, if the Communists had been affiliated from 1939 onwards, the Party would not have been torn by internal strife and the unity of the nation, which is the keystone of victory over Fascism, imperilled? **Communist affiliation during the war would have been a disaster.**

In case any reader should regard this view as unjust and unworthy, let us recall a declaration entitled "Communists and the Labour Party," issued by the Central Committee of the Communist Party on November 23, 1939. In that statement they said:

"The question of the affiliation of the Communist Party to the Labour Party is fundamentally affected by the changed conditions. Our letter, sent in answer to the Labour Party Executive refusal to place the issue before the Labour Party Conference and organisations, made clear that the character of the demand is now changed.

"THE LETTER EXPRESSED THE FULL OPPOSITION OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY TO THE OFFICIAL POLICY AND LEADERSHIP OF THE LABOUR PARTY. THE DEMAND FOR AFFILIATION IS THUS IN NO SENSE A DEMAND FOR A UNITED FRONT WITH THE UPPER LEADERSHIP OF THE LABOUR PARTY, BUT A LEVER OF STRUGGLE AGAINST THE OFFICIAL LEADERSHIP AND POLICY IN ORDER TO PROMOTE THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE UNITED STRUGGLE OF THE WORKERS IN THE FACTORIES AND LOCAL ORGANISATIONS."

IN THE LIGHT OF EXPERIENCE THROUGH TWO DECADES BEFORE THE WAR, AND IN THE LIGHT OF EXPERIENCE DURING THE WAR, THE INESCAPABLE AND COMPELLING CONCLUSION IS THAT AFFILIATION OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY NOW WOULD ALSO BE A DISASTER.

COMMUNIST PROPAGANDA AND LABOUR PARTY FACTS

Communist propaganda claims that the Communist Party's application for affiliation to the Labour Party is winning increasing support from Labour Party organisations.

Supporting organisations are listed as follow:

National Trade Unions	7
District Trade Union Committees	98
Trade Union Branches	1,345
Divisional and Local Labour Parties and Trades and Labour Councils	181

Is it true in fact that the Communists are making a serious breach in the solid defences of Labour Party unity against the entry of Communist discord, disunity and disruption?

HARD FACTS ARE THE BEST ANSWER TO PLAUSIBLE ASSERTIONS

Let us look at the Communist claims. What proportion do they represent of the organisations affiliated to the Labour Party?

Number of National Trade Unions	67
Number of Branches of Trade Unions (excluding Unions whose membership is under 10,000)	20,330
Number of Divisional and Local Labour Parties and Trades and Labour Councils	2,711

It is clear from these figures that the Communist Party has failed to shake the opposition of the vast majority of Party organisations.

But that is not all.

Some of the organisations they list as supporters of affiliation have stipulated an important condition.

A CONDITION THAT CANNOT BE MET

The Mineworkers' Federation, for example, are in favour of affiliation being granted "*provided the Communist Party agrees to accept and abide by the Constitution of the Labour Party.*"

That condition is a crucial one. *But it is not within the free choice of the Communist Party to fulfil it.* The Communist Party has no right of self-determination.

Unlike the Mineworkers' Federation, which is **free** to decide to support or reject or approve conditionally Communist Party affiliation, the latter body is **not free** to decide and pledge itself "to accept and abide by" the Labour Party's Constitution.

If the Communist Party gave such a pledge it would only be because the Communist International ordered or permitted it to do so. The pledge would therefore be worthless.

That judgment is not founded on prejudice; it is based on the constitutional and practical subjection of the Communist Party to the Communist International *whose decisions are obligatory for all sections and must be promptly carried out.*

IRRECONCILABLE ANTAGONISMS

"Experience has shown," the Labour Party declares, "that any attempt to unite opposing political principles of a fundamental character is a waste of time."

The Labour Party, *because it is a Socialist Party*, stands for Democracy—Government of the People by the People for the People.

The Communist International (and *all* its sections) stand for "the dictatorship of the proletariat"—dictatorship *over* the people by the Communist Party in a one-party State.

Democracy and Dictatorship are incapable of reconciliation because they are fundamentally antagonistic and mutually contradictory.

It would be foolish self-delusion to believe that *real* unity of policy, purpose and action can be built on fundamental antagonism.

**COMMUNIST AFFILIATION WOULD
IMPERIL THE UNITY & POWER OF THE
DEMOCRATIC LABOUR MOVEMENT**

HX 632 A1 W9 NO-795
WORLD COMMUNISM IN THE 20TH
CENTURY A COLLECTION OF
PAMPHLETS ACCOMPANIED BY A
39268382 HSS



* 000003985330 *

DATE DUE SLIP

